

---

# Introduction

---

Interaction between Cyprus and the Aegean has clearly been a subject of intensive discussion. The interpretation of the archaeological data and the intersection models proposed for them, however, were never systematically tested against the evidence available [...] Often these interpretations are only subjective impressions or speculations, while in some cases the distinction among observation, interpretation and speculation is not clear. (Portugali, Knapp 1985, 45)

The present volume begins with this citation because it so clearly expresses the complexity inherent to the study of Cypro-Aegean interaction and the need for an in-depth assessment of the available evidence. In examining these interactions, the present book does not attempt to develop a new, original theoretical model. Instead, assuming that Bronze Age trade was not unidirectional, it provides a synthesis of the available archaeological data from the third millennium BC to ca 1200 BC from both the Aegean and Cypriot perspectives in the hope of contributing to further studies. The present study finds its foundation in the archaeological record since “the data should always form the basis of any theoretical model” (Antoniadou 2003, 3).

However, before discussing the archaeological evidence, it is essential to recognize the vast bibliography that provides the theoretical framework for the use of material culture to the interpretation

of the archaeological record (Iacono 2018, 8-34 with refs). Specifically, for Cypro-Aegean interaction, the theoretical frameworks impacting current interpretations of the Cypriot archaeological record and Cypro-Aegean interaction were discussed clearly in Antoniadou's 2003 review of the major trends in the interpretations of trade and contacts between the two areas (Antoniadou 2003, 6-13). More recently, in an article published in 2022, B. Knapp stated his views on the possible trade mechanisms at work between the Aegean and Cyprus (Knapp 2022, 81), but his previous theoretical discussion, which delved into the history and development of several key concepts involving Cypro-Aegean interactions, must also be recognized (Knapp 2008, 12-65). Starting from 'island theories', Knapp's earlier discussion focused point by point on the historically pertinent and perpetually evolving concepts in the social sciences, specifically social identity, ethnicity, migration, acculturation, and hybridization. For the theoretical perspective adopted throughout the present book, the development of these concepts is reviewed by F. Nani in chapter 1 and placed within the context of her wider discussion on social theories.

Since Cypro-Aegean interaction must inescapably be considered in the wider Mediterranean context, several studies are important for their basic contribution to the theoretical approach to interactions and modes of interaction in the "Middle Sea".<sup>1</sup> In terms of modes of long-distance trade, there has recently been debate over the ways cultural and commercial contacts in the Mediterranean have had repercussions on Cypro-Aegean interaction.<sup>2</sup> This debate originated from two different interpretative models. The first and most prevalent model envisions long-distance trade between Sardinia and Cyprus over a direct southern trade route involving Sicily, Crete and Cyprus, while an alternative interpretation suggests a more complex trade system with interconnected local, interregional and international routes involving Cyprus, Sardinia, Sicily, southern Italy, Malta, Crete, the Greek mainland and the Southeastern Aegean. This debate, however, does not directly affect the interpretation of Cypro-Aegean interaction throughout all the periods of mutual contacts because the range of trade contacts between the Aegean and Cyprus is much more restricted than that of the long-distance international trade between Sardinia and Cyprus. More importantly, the various areas involved in these contacts had a long tradition of strong cultural and material links connecting them well before the advanced phases of the Late Bronze Age when the evidence of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. for example, Antoniadou 2003, 25-33; Manning, Hulin 2005, 2-7; Broodbank 2013, 18-25; Iacono 2020, 34-8, with earlier refs.

<sup>2</sup> Russell, Knapp 2017; Bürge, Fischer 2019, 239 with refs; Sabatini, Lo Schiavo 2020; Perra, Lo Schiavo 2021; Knapp et al. 2021.

interaction is more apparent. However, the existence of various interaction spheres is, in my view, quite plausible within the relatively restricted ambit of the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean. The different areas where the artifacts discussed in this study were found would have been part of an active interaction sphere that encompassed Cyprus, southern coastal Anatolia, and the southernmost Aegean including Crete (Knapp 2022, 82 fig. 5). According to Knapp's recent model, this can be regarded as one of the interaction spheres which "rested in the hands of certain people in multiple coastal or island polities that were beyond the control of the major, land-based powers such as New Kingdom Egypt or the Hittite state, perhaps even the sea-girt Minoans" (Knapp 2022, 82). However, if we accept the model of a direct southern route in the Mediterranean involving Sardinia and Cyprus as extremities, it should be acknowledged that, at least in certain periods, the contacts between the Aegean and Cyprus were to a certain extent not only due to a direct interest in reciprocal trade, but also to their strategic location on this long Mediterranean trade-route.

The ca 1200 BC temporal limit of the current book must also be addressed. While the reasons for the use of this end date are explained in more detail in the Epilogue, it is primarily based on the clear and dramatic changes that marked the end of the thirteenth century BC and the beginning of the twelfth century BC, both in the Aegean and on Cyprus, and by their effects on interaction between the two areas. The dramatic destructions by fire and/or abandonments near the end of the LH IIIB phase or during the transitional phase between LH IIIB2 and LH IIIC Early when the Palatial Mycenaean period ended are well known in Late Bronze Age Aegean history. Even though the causes of this turmoil, which especially affected the Greek mainland, remain a matter for debate, it is quite clear that the Postpalatial period of LH IIIC was a time of marked instability throughout the Aegean.

In the last decades of the thirteenth century BC there also were unsettled conditions and severe disruptions in Late Cypriot society, although these were not uniform over the entire island. Signs of trouble with traces of destruction appear at Enkomi and Sinda and abandonments are apparent at *Morphou Toumba tou Skourou*, *Maroni Vournes*, and *Kalavassos Ayios Dhimitrios*, while at other primary towns such as Kition and Kouklia *Palaepaphos* no apparent settlement interruption can be traced. The foundation of the short-lived defensive settlements of *Pyla Kokkinokremos* and *Maa Palaeokastro* can be dated before the end of the period.

In the following phases of the twelfth century a high level of cultural development, economic prosperity, and participation in international trade appeared in the urban centers that had uninterrupted occupation. During LC IIIA, many general changes occur, especially

in the ceramic record, funerary customs, domestic architecture, and religious practices, as well as in metal types and elite craft production. In the past, many scholars shared the opinion that most of these changes were due to the arrival on Cyprus of a new population group from the Aegean as a consequence of the collapse of the Mycenaean palaces, and LC III was considered the period of the Mycenaean colonization of Cyprus. In these historical reconstructions, particular importance was placed on the changes in the LC IIIA ceramic production that showed a marked increase in the local manufacture of Mycenaean-type pottery, which was considered the main ethnic marker of the emigration of Aegean people to Cyprus. Now the perspective has changed and the appearance of at least some local Aegean-type vessels may be assigned to the LC IIC Late phase, predating the disruptions allegedly considered the mark of the arrival of a displaced Mycenaean population. Moreover, other archaeological evidence shows that the “Aegeanisation” of certain Cypriot cultural traits in the LC IIIA period had their roots in the preceding periods, and in most cases this phenomenon should be interpreted as a process of “hybridization” that is one of the most distinctive cultural features of the LC IIC-III periods.

Although the unsettled times around 1200 BC have a determinant impact on the content of this book, trade contacts were not completely interrupted between the Aegean and Cyprus at this time, although reciprocal imports appear more scattered after this critical period. In 1994, E. Cline wrote that “not a single ceramic vessel from Cyprus appears in LH/LM IIIC contexts, which is quite a change from the earlier LH/LM IIIA and LH IIIB periods”. However, thanks to more recent research and publications, Cypriot ceramic finds from the Aegean are now documented, and the use of Cypriot copper in the Greek mainland, on Crete and on other Aegean islands is also confirmed in LM/LH IIIC. Some evidence for contacts between the two islands also comes from Cyprus where Cretan transport stirrup jars continued to be exported and some cult elements of Cretan derivation have been suggested for twelfth and eleventh centuries BC finds. Nevertheless, it is evident that by ca 1200 BC many aspects of the long-lasting process of Cypro-Aegean contacts disappeared and interaction between the two areas took new forms.

## A Short Overview of Previous Scholarship on the Archaeological Evidence of Cypro-Aegean Interaction

### The Discovery of Reciprocal Contacts

If we compare overall the archaeological record documenting Cypro-Aegean interactions from the two areas, a discrepancy exists with substantially more Aegean imports found on Cyprus than Cypriot artifacts found throughout the Aegean. However, apart from occasional earlier finds, only at the end of the 1800s and in the first decades of the 1900s is there recognition of the significant evidence of reciprocal contacts between the Aegean and Cyprus.

On Cyprus, after an earlier phase of Cypriot archaeology (Bombardieri 2011; 2024), following the activities of Luigi Palma di Cesnola and his brother Alessandro on the island in the late 1800's,<sup>3</sup> some Mycenaean vases were included in the *Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus*, a scholarly catalog of the Cypriot antiquities stored in the Metropolitan Museum of Art at New York and published in 1914 by J.L. Myres (1914, 45-50). In addition, some Aegean artifacts also recovered by the Palma di Cesnola brothers have been published in detail in more recent publications (Karageorghis 2000a, 26 no. 16, 46-50 nos 70-1, 70 no. 113). Also, in the last decades of the 1800s, thirty-seven Mycenaean vessels from Cyprus were mentioned in the pioneering study of Mycenaean vessels by Furtwängler and Loeschcke (1886, 24-31, pls XIII-XIV, XXII), and in 1899 some "Mycenaean vases" were listed and discussed in the catalog of the collections stored in the Cyprus Museum. The publication of this collection by Myres and Ohnefalsch Richter distinguished "Genuine imported vases" from so-called "Native imitations" of Mycenaean vases, which indeed included many Iron Age vessels (Myres, Ohnefalsch Richter 1899, 40, 50, pl. III: nos 431, 434, 435; also cf. Myres 1914, 45-53 for this ceramic distinction). The most significant increase at the end of the century to the number of known Aegean finds from Cyprus arose from the excavations of the British Museum expedition, whose main purpose clearly was to enrich the Museum collections by acquiring interesting objects. These include the Turner Bequest Excavations at Amathous in 1893-4 and at Kourion in 1895,<sup>4</sup> and in 1897 the British Museum team found more than 90 Mycenaean whole and partial vessels, as well as three LM IIIB vessels in a cemetery at Maroni *Tsaroukkas* (Manning, Monks 1998, 297-8 with refs). At Hala Sultan Tekke, following a trench opened in 1894

<sup>3</sup> De Agostini 1871; Palma di Cesnola 1879; Palma di Cesnola 1891; Bombardieri 2015.

<sup>4</sup> Murray et al. 1900, 57-86, 72-4, figs 124-7; Kiely 2009a; 2009b; 2019, 18-22.

by J.L. Myres, a team under the directions of H.B. Walter and J.W. Crowfoot excavated several tombs in 1897 and 1898 that contained many Aegean imports (Bailey 1976, 1-32; Åström, Bailey 1976; Fischer 2019b). In the course of the early British expeditions, several Mycenaean vessels, including Pictorial kraters, were also found at Kladhia<sup>5</sup> and elsewhere.

While these sites yielded significant finds, by far the greatest number of Aegean imports were found at Enkomi, the main Late Bronze Age site on Cyprus, which was largely unknown to scholars before 1896 (Kiely 2019, 9) when the British Museum expedition excavated some one hundred LBA tombs (Murray et al. 1900, 72 figs 124, 126, 128; Kiely 2019, 23-4). The British excavators of Enkomi wrote that this “pottery of the Mycenaean kind was constantly found in our excavations” along with ivories, bronzes, jewelry, and other artifacts which they compared to Aegean items (Murray et al. 1900, 6). Accounts of these excavations and their scientific limitations are well known (Steel 2001), but new opportunities for study have recently arisen with the online publications of the Aegean finds from the Enkomi tombs stored in the British and Cyprus Museums (Crewe 2009a; Pilides 2023), although some objects from the site are also dispersed in other museums of the world (Gubel, Massar 2019, 193-6, figs 1-35, with refs).

The most mature phase of Cypriot archaeology began with the activities of the Swedish mission to Cyprus (1927-31). Over ca 40 years, the members of the Swedish missions further illuminated the nature of Cypro-Aegean contacts and data was regularly published in the volumes of the monumental series of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (1934-72). This series remains an absolutely essential source for the study of Cypriot prehistory and later periods on account of the unprecedented attention paid to stratigraphical details and descriptions and to the classification of the finds. Subsequent excavations at Enkomi by the French (Schaeffer 1936; 1956; 1971) and Cypriot (Dikaios 1969-71) missions further illustrated contacts with the Aegean and other Mediterranean areas, but the Turkish occupation of the north part of Cyprus in 1974 brought about the end of the excavations at Enkomi.

Turning to important finds that provide the earliest evidence of Cypriot artifacts in the Aegean, the overall imports are relatively few and of various categories, so we can review them individually piece by piece here. One of the first discovered Cypriot vessels from the Aegean is a White Slip I bowl found below the eruption deposits on Thera in 1870 during excavations in the area of Akrotiri (Cline 1994,

<sup>5</sup> Smith 1925, section IIcb, 4, pl. 2: no. 17; 4-5, pl. 3: nos 17, 19; 5-6, pl. 4: nos 13, 27; 6, pl. 5: nos 12-14; 7, pl. 6: no. 12; 7, pl. 7: nos 8, 12; 7, pl. 8: nos 4, 12; 8, pl. 9: no. 8; 8, pl. 10: nos 4, 9, 11; 9, pl. 11: no. 17; 10, pl. 12: no. 34; for these vases also cf. Walters 1912.

186 no. 455; Portugali, Knapp 1985, 78 no. 153; Manning 1999, 151 fig. 31). Preceding this are the finds of Cypriot bronzes, a rapier and a spearhead, that were recovered during Biliotti's excavations at Ialysos (Rhodes) and published in 1886 by Furtwängler and Loeschcke (1886, pl. D: 3, 7; also cf. Benzi 2009, 50 fn. 21, for further refs). Benzi has also mentioned not only additional bronzes from Biliotti's excavations, which "may be more safely regarded as influence rather than imports" (Benzi 2009, 50-1 fn. 27), but also other finds, such as glass pendants and faience scarabs which were imported from Cyprus or other Eastern Mediterranean regions (Benzi 2009, 52-3 fns 34, 36, 47 with refs). While six sherds belonging to a White Slip I bowl were discovered in a mixed layer at Phylakopi on Melos at the end of the nineteenth century (Edgar et al. 1904, 100, 158 fig. 148, a-c), Crete also produced early evidence for Cypriot-Minoan connections. A handmade Red-Lustrous spindle-bottle was found in Area 67 at Gournia,<sup>6</sup> but because its shape is typical of the Red Lustrous Wheelmade Ware, it is uncertain whether it should be attributed to Cypriot manufacture, and the place of production can now be considered possibly Anatolia (Kozal 2015; Kibaroglu et al. 2019; also see here § 5.3.1.1); however, this Gournia spindle-bottle is handmade, which could indicate that it is a Cypriot item with a shape inspired by wheelmade examples.

Oxhide ingots were also found at Gournia during the early excavations between 1901 and 1904. Four fragments of these oxhide ingots were analyzed using Lead Isotope Analysis and were found to be made of copper from the Apliki mines on Cyprus (Mangou, Ioannou 2000, 213: A, D; Betancourt 2014b, 65-6 nos 2-5, with earlier refs). Another oxhide ingot was found at the beginning of the twentieth century in the area south of the "Long Corridor" in the Palace of Knossos, but the possible Cypriot origin of the copper has not been determined (see § 4.3.2.1).<sup>7</sup> Concerning the discovery of other oxhide ingots on Crete in this period, lead isotope analysis of three samples from the LM IIIC quarter excavated in the Piazzale dei Sacelli at Ayia Triada and a LM IIIC half ingot from the same site (Lo Schiavo et al. 2013, with refs) determined that the copper was consistent with the same Cypriot origin as the Gournia ingot fragments. This signature differs from the oxhide ingots from Vano 7 in the "Royal Villa" whose source of copper remains unknown. The origin of three other examples from Tylissos and two of the six ingots from Zakros (see § 4.3.2.1 with refs) also remain unknown.

<sup>6</sup> Boyd-Hawes et. al. 1908, 42 pl. VIII.25.2; Cadogan 1972, 5; Portugali, Knapp 1985, 78 no. 149; Mantzourani, Theodorou 1991, 55 no. 13.

<sup>7</sup> Mantzourani, Theodorou 1991, 55 no. 7; Lambrou-Phillipson 1990, 128 no. 12; Eveley 2000, 344 no. 33; Mangou, Ioannou 2000, 208: KN/162.

The list of other Cypriot objects found in Crete during this early period of excavations includes some sealings from the Palace of Knossos (see discussion in § 5.3.3.1), a LBA iron knife with bronze nails from a LM IIIC context in tholos 5 at Vrokastro (Cadogan 1972, 9-10 with earlier refs; Mantzourani, Theodorou 1991, 55 no. 12), and a LBA cylinder seal from a burial at Palaikastro dubiously attributed to LM III.<sup>8</sup>

Turning to the Argolid, it is worth emphasizing the early discovery of some prestige finds of Cypriot manufacture, such as a faience goblet from Tsountas' excavations in Tomb 49 (Cline 1994, 197 no. 560 with refs) and a hematite cylinder seal from Tomb 47 (Portugali, Knapp 1985, 77 no. 132) at Mycenae, as well as a gold bucranium that was part of the so-called "Tiryns Treasure" discovered in 1915 in the Citadel of Tiryns (Portugali, Knapp 1985, 77 no. 137).

## The Developments of Research on Cypro-Aegean Interaction

When considering the developments of Cypriot archaeology in the second half of the twentieth century, it should be noted that research took on a relevant international role, with many important publications stemming from the scientific interest in Cypriot contacts with neighboring areas. Antoniadou has rightly stated that

within the conceptual and methodological framework of the culture-historical approach, Cyprus' external contacts were divided into geographical areas and studied respectively: Cyprus and the Aegean, including Mainland Greece and Crete, Cyprus and the Near East, and Cyprus and Egypt. The relation between Cyprus and Anatolia had yet to be explored as well as that with Sardinia, these being dependent on later discoveries. (Antoniadou 2003, 8)

Reference can also be made to Antoniadou's *raisonné* review, which addresses the various problems concerning Cypro-Aegean contacts from the Cypriot perspective. It begins from Catling's 1964 comprehensive study on Cypriot bronzework and includes a discussion on the possibility of Mycenaean colonization (Antoniadou 2003, 7-25, and 10-11 for a review of the studies concerning contacts between Crete and Cyprus). While it is impossible to review in detail here all the individual scholarship, Vassos Karageorghis and Paul Åström can be recognized as two of the most eminent scholars of Cypriot archaeology due to their excavations, research activities, and extensive publications on

<sup>8</sup> Bosanquet 1901-02, 302 fig. 18.2; CMS II, 3 no. 282; Davaras, Soles 1995, 57 no. 77; Pini 2014, 329 no. 9.



a wide range of topics related to the Cypriot Bronze Age and Cypro-Aegean interaction. The dissemination of research on Cypriot archaeology and the island's external contacts has benefited substantially from contributions to the series *Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology* founded by Paul Åström (cf. Jung 2012a), as well as from many conference proceedings and other publications mentioned below.

Turning to the Aegean, due to the small number of Cypriot imports and their diffuse scatter found in the early phases of research, until recently there was the widely shared opinion that very few Cypriot artifacts were to be found in the Aegean regions, and it was also assumed that all the Cypriot artifacts traveling westward were shipped only because they were accompanying copper (Cline 1994, 60; Knapp 2022, 74). However, with continued research, the number of Cypriot imports identified has increased substantially, especially in the Argolid, the Dodecanese, and on Crete where Cypriot artifacts of various categories (Knapp 2022, 75) have been found. Additional evidence of Cypriot finds in the Aegean are presented in detail in chapters 5-7 of the present book and the early impressions of limited exchange must be revised.

To complete the short overview of previous scholarship after the earliest discoveries of reciprocal imports, only a synthesis of the most notable publications is possible because of the sheer volume of impressive research addressing the problems inherent to reconstructing interactions between Cyprus and the Aegean. I am well aware that the mention of only a few publications within the *mare magnum* of the relevant archaeological literature inevitably results in a very partial selection. For this reason, in this book I refer mainly to collective works and mention only the most frequently cited publications, with apologies for all unintentional omissions.

Beginning with the acts of conferences and collective works containing contributions dealing with Cypro-Aegean interaction in the Bronze Age, as early as the 1970s the various problems concerning both Mycenaean and Minoan relations with Cyprus were discussed at international conferences (Karageorghis 1973; 1979a), and a review of the Bronze Age Cypriot objects found in the Aegean was also published in *Acts of the First International Congress of Cypriot Studies* (Cadogan 1972). In 1986, a symposium dealing with the cultural location of Cyprus between the Occident and the Orient was held (Karageorghis 1986a), while in the nineties there were new conferences focusing on Cypro-Aegean interconnections (Karageorghis 1991; Christou 1997) and particular attention was devoted to the contacts between Cyprus, the Dodecanese and Crete (Karageorghis, Stampolidis 1998) and to the Cypriot shipwreck at Point Iria in the Argolid (Phelps, Lolos, Vichos 1999). In the following years various contributions of Cypro-Aegean interest were published in the acts of conferences held in Rethymno (Stampolidis, Karageorghis 2003) and

in Athens (Laffineur, Greco 2005). More recently, the connections between Cyprus and the Dodecanese in the light of the new evidence also were the subject of several papers presented in a symposium held on Samos (Karageorghis, Kouka 2009), while some questions concerning the suggested presence of Mycenaeans in Cyprus in the twelfth century BC were discussed in a symposium in 2011 (Karageorghis, Kouka 2011). Interest in the connections between Crete and Cyprus has also increased and a conference organized by the British School at Athens, the University of Crete, and the University of Cyprus compared the evidence from the two islands (Cadogan et al. 2012). Additional important contributions highlighting the connections between Crete and Cyprus can be found in recent collective works (Karageorghis et al. 2014; Macdonald, Hatzaki, Andreou 2015). While the proceedings from a conference in Heidelberg dealt with the cultural contacts in different Mediterranean regions between the end of the Late Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age (Babbi et al. 2015), Cypriot connectivity in the Mediterranean from approximately the Middle Bronze Age to the Roman period was discussed specifically at a conference held in Athens in 2020 (Bourogiannis 2022).

At its essence, this book relies on the published reviews of reciprocal imports both to the Aegean and Cyprus, with other relevant evidence also used to enrich the interpretations of the archaeological evidence. A survey of these contributions begins with the list of Minoica from Cyprus published by Catling and Karageorghis in 1960, while the above mentioned Cadogan's review of Cypriot objects from the Aegean has also greatly enhanced our knowledge of Cypro-Aegean connections (Cadogan 1972). In 1985, Portugali and Knapp published a spatial analysis of Cypro-Aegean interaction between the seventeenth and fourteenth centuries BC that was complemented by short catalogs of the Aegean objects on Cyprus and the Cypriot objects in the Aegean (Portugali, Knapp 1985, 70-8). In the following decade, in addition to a list of Cypriot finds on Crete, published as part of an appendix to a paper on the sea-routes between Crete and Cyprus (Mantzourani, Theodorou 1991), two important books by Lambrou-Phillipson (1990) and Cline (1994) contained catalogs of "*orientalia*" found in the Bronze Age Aegean and included the Cypriot imports as a notable component. From the Cypriot perspective, two lists of the Cypriot sites where Mycenaean pottery was found were published by M. Pacci (1986) and later by M.P. Toti (1994), while G.J. van Wijngaarden presented a thorough discussion and a catalog on the Mycenaean pottery found on Cyprus, particularly focusing on the finds from Enkomi, Athienou, and Apliki (Van Wijngaarden 2002, 125-202, 290-300, tabs VI-X, 314-15, 323-5, maps 8-9, 346-77, catalogs I, V-VII; also cf. Van Wijngaarden 2007; 2016). In addition, A.H. Sørensen (2008, 173-90) published a catalog of Minoan finds on Cyprus that date to the early LM periods.

While reiterating that it is impossible to mention all scholars of Cypro-Aegean interaction, the scientific research of several scholars such as R. Merrillees (1979; 2001; 2009), N. Papadimitriou (2012; 2015; 2022), S. Antoniadou (2003; 2005; 2007; 2011), and A. Papadopoulos (2011; 2012; 2022) has led to important contributions on various aspects of Cypro-Aegean interaction. Also of exceptional value are the varied and wide research activities of Knapp who has specifically contextualized Cypro-Aegean connections within the framework of the cultural and commercial role of Cyprus between the West and the East.<sup>9</sup>

Moving beyond individual researchers and their contributions, a brief summary of the evolution of research on the topic of Cypro-Aegean interaction is also informative. Several basic studies on the Aegean pottery imported to Cyprus are well known and still remain indispensable for comprehending Cypro-Aegean interactions.<sup>10</sup> This early work promoted new research and stimulated the development of a vast quantity of archaeological literature. Following this direction, subsequent contributions are also worthy of consideration.<sup>11</sup> Among these recent works, the monumental study of P. Mountjoy (2018) on the decorated pottery dating to the twelfth century BC recovered on Cyprus and in Philistia raised awareness of the Aegean pottery from Cyprus to an unprecedented level. Moreover, Neutron Activation Analysis and Petrography of ceramic finds have provided the fundamental data needed to correctly identify the predominantly Argive origin of the Mycenaean pottery from Cyprus<sup>12</sup> and the Cypriot origin of imports to Kommos (Tomlinson, Rutter, Hoffman 2010).

Research on Cypriot interactions has also evolved with the examination of contacts other than those with Crete and the Argolid. For example, based on additional work after the pioneering excavations on Rhodes, the key role of the Dodecanese in Cypriot-Aegean interactions is now clearly demonstrated. Among recent contributions, not only are the proceedings from the conference held in the Dodecanese mentioned above relevant, but a wide repertoire of other studies documents the discovery of Cypriot pottery, local imitations of Cypriot pottery, and other Cypriot artifacts among the finds of Eastern Aegean island sites.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Knapp 1990a, 2008; 2012b; 2013a; 2015; 2021; 2022; Knapp, Cherry 1994.

<sup>10</sup> Furumark 1941; Stubbings 1951; P. Åström 1972; 1973; 1979; 1983; 1998; Vermeule, Karageorghis 1982.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. for example, Kling 1989a; 1991; 2000; Steel 1998; 1999; 2004b; 2004c; 2023; Mountjoy 2004; 2008; 2010; 2015; 2020; Jung 2011a; 2011b; 2015.

<sup>12</sup> Catling, Jones, Millet 1978; Jones 1986; Bryan et al. 1997; Mommsen, Beier, Åström 2003; Yellin 2007; Mountjoy, Mommsen 2015; 2019.

<sup>13</sup> Benzi 2009, 49-53, 55-6; Marketou 1998a; 2009a; 2009b; Marketou et al. 2006; Karageorghis, Marketou 2006; Karantzali 2005; 2009.

Another import topic in Cypriot archaeology that has continued to evolve and is supplemented by a wide breadth of literature concerns the diffusion of oxhide ingots and copper/bronze artifacts made of Cypriot copper throughout the Aegean. Several scholars, such as Muhly (2009; Muhly et al. 1988; Muhly, Kassianidou 2012), Gale (1991; 2011), Stos-Gale (1988; 2000; 2001; 2011; 2015; Stos-Gale, Gale 2003; Stos-Gale, Macdonald 1991), Mangou, Ioannou (2000), Liard (2010), Sabatini (2016), and, last but not the least, Kassianidou (2003; 2008-12; 2013a; 2014; 2021; 2022), deserve recognition here for their substantial contributions to the methodological, interpretative, and archaeological discussions concerning Cypriot metallurgy and Cypro-Aegean trade in oxhide ingots.

In this short review of previous scholarship the age-old question of the so-called “Aegean colonization” of Cyprus must be mentioned as one of the most debated topics concerning Cypro-Aegean interaction in the Bronze Age, but here it is only mentioned without an in-depth discussion of the wide relevant literature since this topic belongs to an archaeological period beyond the scope of this book (see, however, §§ 1.3.3, 1.4 for a discussion on various theoretical interpretations).

Finally, the importance of reconstructing the Cypriot social context in order to understand Cypriot trade cannot be neglected. S. Sherratt (2016), for example, has emphasized the social role of the maritime mercantile elites on Cyprus, especially in the thirteenth century BC, and N. Meyer and Knapp (2023) have recently discussed the mercantile class on the island as powerful actors within Cypriot society throughout the entire Late Bronze Age.

## The Structure of the Book

As pointed out above, the aim of this book is to present a review of the archaeological data concerning Cypro-Aegean interaction from the third millennium BC to ca 1200 BC from both the Aegean and Cypriot perspectives and within the historical background of the two areas. While chapter 1 comprises the theoretical introduction written by Francesca Nani and chapter 2 discusses the comparative chronology, the subsequent chapters are organized chronologically with internal divisions used to present the regional evidence related to each temporal period. For clarity, the discussion of regional evidence is further subdivided by find categories. Since historical context is a necessary prerequisite for comprehending archaeological data, before the detailed regional evidence is presented, each chapter begins with a section devoted to a historical synopsis of the research in both the Aegean and on Cyprus. In chapter 7, various aspects of the development of Cypro-Aegean interaction presented in the preceding chapters are reconsidered and particular problems

are discussed in more depth. Several chapters include contributions from collaborators who address specific topics that complement the general analysis of the archaeological evidence. These include a case study on the LH IIIA and LH IIIB pottery from funerary contexts at Enkomi by Lorenzo Mazzotta and Laerke Recht in chapter 5 and an analysis of the local production of Aegean-style pottery on Cyprus that substantially enhances the discussion of Cypro-Aegean interaction in the LC IIC by Artemis Georgiou in § 6.4.3. The book also includes a contribution by Angiolo Querci in the Appendix that considers the impacts of nautical factors to Cyprus-Aegean connections.

Needless to say, the overwhelming majority of available evidence of reciprocal contacts is provided by pottery. Some preliminary remarks are therefore necessary about the classification of Aegean ceramic imports to Cyprus. Although in this volume reference is always made to Furumark's basic classification of Mycenaean pottery, functional categories are also distinguished, although their distinction is not intended as an alternative system of shape classification. As far as functional categories are concerned, it must be recognized that, generally speaking, every individual vessel throughout its lifespan may have been used for more than a single purpose; however, the shape can be considered indicative of its original intended function. A jug, for example, is primarily a pouring vessel, although it may also occasionally be used as a storage or a multi-functional container as can sometimes be inferred from the find's context. While a vessel's individual use life is interesting, when applied to groups of imported vessels with the same intended function, the functional categories distinguished in this book establish an additional system of classification that can provide insight on aspects of the market rules governing trade of Aegean pottery and/or the functional preferences of Cypriot people according to their needs and/or tastes. In terms of Aegean ceramic imports to Cyprus, it should also be noted here that not all the Aegean-type vessels of Cypriot production, especially the three-handled jars FS 46 and FS 47 and the local "Levanto-Helladic" and White Painted Wheelmade III pottery, have been included in the accompanying tables since they cannot be considered Aegean imports in their own right. However, the careful discussion of Artemis Georgiou in § 6.4.3 is a contribution of great importance for understanding the development of pottery production on Cyprus in the thirteenth century BC.

Finally, this book admittedly does not provide a complete catalog of all Aegean imports antedating the period around 1200 BC. The catalog of Aegean pottery from Cyprus published by P. Åström as part of volume IV, part 1D, of the *Swedish Cyprus Expedition* (Åström 1972) is the primary catalog of Aegean imports published before 1972, including detailed references to earlier publications, and it provides the most comprehensive source of discussion and review of Aegean

vessels up to this date. Therefore, for the sake of brevity, when the Aegean imports antedating Åström's catalog are incorporated in the tables and discussion in this book, reference is made to his work. However, due to the presence of a few gaps in his catalog and in light of more recent studies, clarification and elaboration were in some cases necessary (see § 5.4.1.4 fn. 28; also see § 5.4.1.4.1). In order to update the list of Aegean vessels, the reviews of reciprocal imports mentioned above, as well as various publications and excavation accounts, have also been taken into account as references to single items published after 1972, but, for the sake of brevity, reference is generally made to the main general reviews of finds since they provide references to previous literature. Moreover it is also important to point out that only well-published finds have been selected for inclusion in the tables and discussion, but unfortunately there are many items, generally undiagnostic fragmentary sherds from settlement deposits, which I was not able to check and classify, in addition to an undefined number of Aegean vessels from Cyprus that are stored in museums and private collections all over the world that have been omitted. Despite these obstacles, I am confident that the repertoire of Aegean pottery examined here is representative of the corpus of Aegean imports to Cyprus and may provide a reliable picture of Cypro-Aegean interaction in the Bronze Age before ca 1200 BC.